

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7, 9-12 and 14 are pending in this application. Claims 6, 8 and 13 have been canceled. Claims 1, 11 and 14 are amended. Reconsideration of the rejections in view of these amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Objections to Claims

Claims 1 and 14 were objected to due to informalities.

Claims 1 and 14 have been amended to overcome the objection.

Rejections under 35 USC §112, Second Paragraph

Claims 11 and 14 were rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite because the claims are allegedly indefinite.

Claims 11 and 14 have been amended to overcome the rejection.

Rejections under 35 USC §102(b)

Claims 1-6 and 8 were rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Shimizu (U.S. Patent No. 4,824,006).

Claim 1 has been amended to recite “forming a two-dimensional paste pattern on a first joining surface of the paste-applied body with a drawn paste line, said two-dimensional pattern including a plurality of segment lines.”

Shimizu discloses a die bonding apparatus which is suitable for use especially in die bonding of an elongated pellet to package. In Shimizu, the apparatus has paste supply means having a needle for supplying paste onto a package to secure a semiconductor pellet, driving means for moving the paste supply means in the directions of X, Y and Z, respectively, follow up means movable up and down for causing the tip of the needle to follow the contour of the paste application surface of the package, and support means for supporting the paste supply means through the follow up means (column 1, lines 29-44).

Thus, Shimizu focuses the discussion on the uniformity of paste application width and thickness of **a single segment**, but it does not teach or suggest “forming a two-dimensional paste pattern on a first joining surface of the paste-applied body with a drawn paste line, said **two-dimensional pattern including a plurality of segment lines.**”

For at least these reasons, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Shimizu. Claims 2-6 and 8, directly or indirectly dependent from claim 1, also patentably distinguish over the cited reference.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Kawabe et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,985,069).

Claim 14 has been amended to recite “wherein said pattern is open in a radial direction.” In Kawabe et al, the patterns **are closed or open in a direction perpendicular to the radial direction.** Thus, Kawabe et al does not teach or suggest “wherein said pattern is open in a radial direction,” as recited in the amended claim 14.

For at least these reasons, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Kawabe et al.

Rejections under 35 USC §103(a)

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Shimizu.

Claim 9, indirectly dependent from claim 1, also patentably distinguishes over the cited reference for at least the same reason discussed above.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, claims, as amended, are in condition for allowance, which action, at an early date, is requested.

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, WESTERMAN & HATTORI, LLP



Sadao Kinashi
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 48,075

SK/fs

Atty. Docket No. **010620**
Suite 1000
1725 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 659-2930



23850

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

H:\HOME\fsakai\amendment\010620-2